DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 798 HE 008 029

AUTHOR Callan, Patrick M.; Jonsen, Richard W.
TITLE Master Planning for the 1980's: The California Experience.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advisory Committees; *Educational Planning; Higher Education; *Legislators; *Master Plans; *Models; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

The California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education made a restudy of the 1960 Master Plan. The process used by the committee is examined. The process is unusual in that it was undertaken by the legislature itself rather than by an independent commission, and also in that it strove for fairly widespread participation and discussion of its problems and proposals. The California process is analyzed and evaluated against several current planning "models." Recommendations of the committee's study are presented, and their subsequent disposition by the legislature and by the voters is discussed. (Author/JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126798

MASTER PLANNING FOR THE 1980'S:

THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Patrick M. Callan

Richard W. Jonsen

HE008029

STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR THE 1980'S: THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Introduction

That planning is a political process insures that it is a controversial one. The recent battle over the New York State review of doctoral programs (11) illustrates both the extension of planning authority and the resistance that extension produces.

"This is the age of planning. . . . This is the age of the multidisciplinary, large-scale approach to systems research for policy-making" (3, p. 4).

The conditions making higher education planning especially urgent and especially controversial are well-known, and have been powerfully documented by Glenny (16) and others.

For critical reading and comments, we acknowledge and thank Robert Berdahl, Jo Ellen Estenson, William Fuller, Lyman Glenny, Ernest Palola, Susan Powell, and C. H. Treadwell. Special thanks to Esther Clark for preparing final manuscript.

As statewide planning has come to play a prominent role in the development of public policy for postsecondary education, scholars and study commissions have developed models and guidelines for planning. But relatively little attention has been given to the description and analysis of the actual practices of individual states. If the generalized and theoretical models are to be tested, refined, and revised, it will be necessary to study the planning process in action. The ultimate goal should be the blending of the perspectives of practitioners and participants with those of theoreticians.

This account of a particular planning effort in one state is written primarily from the practitioner-participant point of view. It deals with the process as well as the outcomes of planning. It attempts to describe and evaluate one approach to planning. Our interest is to evoke criticism and comparison which may lead to improved models.

We describe the planning process used in California higher education in the early 'seventies, and the reassessment of that state's 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. More specifically, we focus on that part of the reassessment undertaken by the state legislature through its Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education (JLC).

A study simultaneously undertaken by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE) will be noted, but not discussed in detail.

Our purposes are: (1) to describe the planning process, (2) to compare that process with some well-known planning models, and (3) to make some judgments concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the California (JLC) approach.

We hope that this paper makes a useful contribution to the growing discussion of higher education planning. The evidence contained in our description of the California "experience" adds, we think, to a needed set of planning cases, which can be utilized for critical review and analysis.

We are, therefore, speaking to those directly involved in planning for higher education, primarily at the state level, as well as to a wider group of scholars and observers of higher education concerned about appropriate, feasible, and effective responses to the troubled present and uncertain future of American higher education.

Our plan for this paper divides it into: (1) Introduction and background (including the context provided by the 1960 Master Plan and its current consequences), (2) Implementation of the JLC restudy, and (3) Evaluation, comparison, analysis.

The changing face of planning

The impetus provided by federal "1202" legislation for the creation of statewide agencies for planning and coordination illustrates the power of the statewide planning "movement," although it does not explain it. It is clear that interest in statewide planning and coordination accompanied the post-World War II enrollment surge. Subsequent planning efforts have been directed primarily at the need to determine the magnitude and location of potential enrollment increases, and estimate and allocate the necessary facilities and resources to accommodate them.

These planning and coordinating efforts have drawn fire from various quarters. Writing in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Harold Enarson said: "Over the years, the coordinating boards have enlarged their jurisdiction and extended their powers. In many states, they have moved inexorably from useful fact-gathering and helpful analysis to outright control and declared intervention into the internal affairs of the universities" (11, p. 16).

The centralization of statewide planning efforts accompanied the immense enrollment growth of higher education in the decades of the 'fifties and 'sixties, and the shift of that enrollment concentration from the private to public institutions. But even while growth was still center stage, there were signs that planning activities would broaden in scope to include qualitative considerations. An illustration of this shift can be found in a comparison of the sequential

phases of Illinois' Master Plan. While Phase I (1964) emphasized expansion of a system of two-year colleges, accessibility to the commuter student, allocation of student enrollment and facilities, Phase II (1966) emphasized urban students, state scholarships and the concept of a "system of systems," and Phase III (1971) emphasized functional diversity (identification of Ph.D. institutions), promoted diversity and distinctiveness, recommended a state learning resources network, and expressed concern with the quality of life (19).

Berdahl takes cognizance of this shift in the planning process from quantitative to qualitative concerns, and notes that Palola, Lehmann, and Blischle predict that "the new challenge of the 1970's will be academic reform, involving reassessment of curricula, programs and methods of instruction and governance" (3, p. 95).[1]

---

[1]The checklist of "planning considerations" developed by the Carnegie Commission, is also supportive evidence of the broadened scope of planning and its increasing qualitative concerns. That "checklist" includes: Statement of goals, quantification of goals, analysis of present enrollment, resources and programs for postsecondary education; present and desirable differentiation of function among institutions; inter-state arrangements, qualitative evaluation of existing program, evaluation of efficiency, present and proposed policies regarding private higher education, admission policies, tuition and financial aid, articulation, adaptability of the system, adequacy of counseling services, analysis of relationship of institutions of postsecondary education to other institutions (9, p. 33).

As the concerns of planning and coordinating agencies push beyond enrollment accommodation, the threat to institutional autonomy naturally becomes more tangible. Rather than minimize the reality of this threat, this paper will attempt, among other things, to emphasize the need to maintain a balance between the control implied by coordination and planning, and the institutional independence required for quality and effectiveness.

Along with a broadening in scope of the planning agency's responsibility, has come an increasing perception of the planning process as one which ought to be relatively more "open" than "closed." Indicators of this development are: (1) increasing involvement of the public and other kinds of postsecondary institutions than colleges and universities in the state planning process; (2) growing recognition that as a "political" process, planning is better carried out through relatively open politics than by those which involved limited negotiations among limited actors.[2]

---

[2]The literature on planning isn't satisfactory on this point. The Carnegie Commission has recommended that master planning be undertaken "by a commission appointed for that purpose with a small staff augmented by special task force as needed" (10, p. 36). The "planning model" designed by Palola, Lehmann and Blische envisions a statewide board with analogous units functioning at system and institutional levels, majority lay membership, a small staff supplemented by the work and temporary task forces (23, p. 570). A similar approach is proposed by Glenny, Berdahl, Palola, and Paltridge in their 1971 handbook on state coordination. The question

The California context: The 1960 Master Plan

The most obvious aspect of the context of the construction of California's 1960 Master Plan is that of growth. In the period 1960-1975 (the years which the Master Plan was designed to encompass), the University of California (UC) was expected to absorb enrollment increases of 246%, the California State Colleges, now the California State University and Colleges (CSUC), 349%, and the Community Colleges 193%.

This enrollment growth meant more campuses, with the increasing political power (community identification, multiplied resources) these implied. It was clear that site selection (and allocation of sites to systems) would be a highly political process.

Another partially political factor which needed review by a

---

of broad "participatory" planning has rarely been addressed. The most current authoritative source (17) barely mentions this aspect of planning, except to approve of Medsker's emphasis upon participation of relevant institutions in the process (p. 29), Wayn' suggestion that more recent planning efforts have included "more open and deliberate attempts to selection of ends" (p. 31) and Hansen's observation that the group process in educational planning may cause the delays and roadblocks (p. 33). Halstead appears to view planning as a mostly technical process.

planning process was the existing differentiation of functions among California's three segments, which accorded the University of California the functions of research and doctoral programs, the State Colleges that of undergraduate studies, teacher training and master's level graduate work, and the Community Colleges lower division transfer work and vocational education.

The accomplishments of the 1960 Master Plan included:

(1) Confirmation of the existing differentiation of function, which secured the hegemony of the University of California over the prestige functions of research, doctoral study, and a pattern of highly selective admissions.

(2) Creation of a fairly weak Coordinating Council, possessing mostly advisory powers, which was dominated, initially, by institutional representatives. This tended to insure that existing institutional prerogatives and relationships would not be aggressively reviewed. However, the Council was effective in its role of reviewing proposals for new campus locations.

(3) Institutionalization of the State College system with its own board of trustees (but failure to secure the recommended constitutional status for this system).

(4) Limitation of the function of the Community Colleges to two years, and the recommendation that they accommodate a larger share of total lower division enrollment of the public "system."

(5) Increased geographical access by authorization of new campuses for all three public segments.

Alongside these and other significant accomplishments of the 1960 Master Plan, and perhaps implicit in them, were several shortcomings:

(1) Because of the nature of the Coordinating Council, the Master Plan really provided no instrument for its own reassessment or for any continuing and genuine reevaluation of the goals and performance of California higher education.

(2) The relationship between public and private higher education was not really analyzed, nor was the question of state aid to the private sector (except in the support given to the State Scholarship program, which was specifically designed primarily to assist private institutions).

(3) No provisions were made for inter-institutional cooperation.

(4) The question of access to higher education was treated largely in quantitative and geographical terms; its more complex aspects were not investigated.

The late 'sixties brought clearer recognition of a number of crucial problems for higher education: the complexities of the problem of college access (especially for disadvantaged students); the plight of private higher education; the inadequacy of uncoordinated institutional autonomy; and the impending slowdown in enrollment growth. These problems

brought the defects of the original Master Plan into focus--especially its failure to provide for a continuous planning process. To these other pressures was added, of course, the supercharged political atmosphere resulting from campus dissent and disruption.

Two reevaluations of the 1960 Master Plan made during the 'sixties were ineffective, but for different reasons.

In 1966, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education publicized a report entitled The Master Plan Five Years Later (12), which was largely a checklist survey of the extent to which legislation and recommendations produced by the 1960 Master Plan had and had not been carried out. The report was not critical beyond the confines of the specific recommendations of the 1960 Plan.

A second reevaluation, The Challenge of Achievement (6), was published by the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature (in 1968). In light of the context of campus disruptions and the political calls for punitive legislation, the report was a serious attempt to re-think some of the important aspects of California higher education, and financing of public higher education. But because the report was written under the chairmanship of Jesse Unruh, whose party had just lost control of the legislature, and who was correctly perceived as a potential challenger to Reagan for the governorship, it got nowhere. To the liability of partisan politics, however, may have been added the liability of the process of the report itself--the politics of planning. The study was almost wholly a staff effort, supplemented by the work of

consultants, and therefore had an extremely narrow political base.

In 1970, two major efforts at reevaluating the ten-year-old Master Plan were undertaken: one by the Legislature, another by the Coordinating Council. The context for reevaluation was provided by some powerful factors: (1) increasing awareness of the weaknesses of the 1960 Plan, as indicated above; (2) the increasing demands made upon state funds by other critically important social services; (3) the declining environment of higher education on the campuses, in the legislature and the governor's office, and among the public.

Because of the decreased credibility of the higher education establishment and the inappropriateness of delegating such a study to the state planning and coordinating agency, when the latter's effectiveness was one of the major issues, the Master Plan review was delegated by the legislature to one of its own committees. Once it became clear that the legislature intended to conduct its own review, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education decided to appoint a blue ribbon citizens committee which would also restudy the Master Plan. The motives for the establishment of the Select Committee were mixed but they appear to have included (1) face-saving for the CCHE, (2) fear of the liberalism of the chairman and some other legislative committee members (though the committee included legislators of all political persuasions represented in the legislature), and (3) the hope of some members of the CCHE and others in the California higher education community that the two studies would create sufficient conflict and confusion to cause a paralysis of public

higher education policy in the state, thereby insuring continuation of the status quo.

The focus of this paper is on the work of the Joint Legislative Committee, rather than that of CCHE, to which we will refer where appropriate in comparison of the two efforts. The charge given by the California Legislature to the JLC was a broad mandate to

> ascertain, study, and analyze all facts relating to the development of a new Master Plan for Higher Education in California, including . . . purposes, functions, and responsibilities . . . governance . . . accountability . . . emphasis now accorded undergraduate and graduate training . . . qualifications for admission . . . rising expectations of low income students . . . review the concept that all qualified students be able to attend higher educational institutions and that all students have equal access to such institutions . . . ability of the state to provide adequate resources (2).

The resolution establishing the JLC was adopted in September, 1970. The committee was appointed in late March, 1971. It adopted a study plan in January, 1972.

One reason for the time delay between enactment and presentation of the study plan was the participative--and, therefore, time-consuming--nature of the process decided upon. The participatory nature of the process was in contrast to the original Master Plan development, which was quite largely a product of institutional participation, and also in contrast to the simultaneous effort of the CCHE

which will be discussed briefly below.[3]

The JLC study was designed and implemented by a very small staff (of three professionals), which accomplished much of the substantive work through contracts with outside consultants who prepared policy alternative papers on various subjects and through advice and recommendations from public and private institutions, interested lay and academic groups, and the general public.

A key device for producing that broad public and institutional input was the creation of an ad hoc advisory committee, which included about ninety persons from public and private institutions at the campus and statewide level: faculty, students and administrators, and lay citizens concerned with higher education in California.

This committee met for a weekend of intensive discussion in September of 1971, with the task of generating a series of major issues for Joint Committee attention. The activities of the ad hoc committee were focused by several preceding events: (1) the circulation of an extensive mailing, to about 1500 Californians, to find out their

---

[3]An illustration of this aspect of the JLC study is the extent to which students participated in it, as they had not participated in the earlier Master Plan study. During the intervening years, the students had developed an effective and sophisticated lobbying effort in Sacramento. Through that instrument, and also by direct participation in the restudy effort, the current study bears the imprint of student advice and counsel. Faculty involvement, too, was an active factor in the current effort, whereas a review of the membership of the 1960 survey team and of its subcommittees, reveals very little in the way of faculty membership.

perception of the major issues facing higher education at that time; (2) an initial hearing, which was the first public activity of the Joint Committee, on the future of society. The papers presented at that hearing by experts concerned with futurology constituted an intelligence briefing for the members of both the Joint Committee and the ad hoc citizens' committee.[4]

With the perspectives provided by these activities, the ad hoc committee framed these issues:

- purposes/goals/relationships of higher education to society
- governance/structure
- access
- alternative forms
- finance
- differentiation of function
- evaluation
- relationship of state government to higher education

---

[4]The ad hoc committee also provided a forum for faculty and student participation in contrast with both the original master plan study and the concurrent CCHE study. The CCHE Select Committee operated primarily through subcommittees of its own membership and staff. The Select Committee included representation from the three public segments of California higher education and the independent colleges. Its public representation which constituted thirteen of its seventeen person membership included no students, no faculty and was drawn from a somewhat narrow socio-economic and occupational range. Nevertheless, there was close cooperation between the CCHE

The fact that those issues were developed by a group fairly broadly representative of California higher education, and, to some extent, of its lay citizenry, gave them credibility which might otherwise have been lacking. This process also created a network of "influentials" in California higher education whose interests and stake in the Joint Committee's work was heightened. Thirdly, it allowed initial institutional input to take place in an open setting, diminishing the possibility of a quiet process of limiting issues to those without bite.

The length of time between the enactment of legislation mandating the Master Plan restudy and the approval of the study plan was probably a factor in the study maintaining a "low profile," and avoiding the hazards of drawing fire from institutions and individuals who felt threatened by its activities. It was thus able to work in a somewhat more placid environment than might otherwise have been the case, and with somewhat more productivity. This time factor also allowed the generation of the highly valued participatory process already discussed. Table 1 (Appendix) summarizes the study plan of the JLC.

The broad scope of the JLC's process was really philosophical, and produced governing assumptions: (1) that the process should include broad institutional, as well as general public representation; (2) that the scope of study should extend beyond the original 1960

Select Committee and the JLC which helped to minimize the possibility of reports with radically different conclusions creating a political impasse.

plan, and include a wide range of subjects generated by initial open inquiry; and (3) that the process of inquiry was itself a valued "outcome" of such a study, and would possibly restore some of the credibility lost of California higher education over the previous half decade.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDY PLAN

Public Hearings

From January through September of 1972 the committee held a series of hearings on the subjects contained in the study plan (see Table 2 - Appendix). Each hearing was publicized well in advance and open to anyone who wished to testify. Each of the segments presented testimony, as well as student and faculty groups, representatives of organizations interested in higher education, and members of the general public. The committee itself occasionally invited experts to offer their views and those who appeared included Neil J. Smelser (Structure), Robert Berdahl and Paul Dressel (Planning), George I. Brown (Alternative Forms), and several others. However, the segments with their large staffs were able to participate more fully than other individuals and groups. Each of the three public segments provided testimony at nearly every hearing.

The general posture of each of the three public segments was one of enthusiastic support for the 1960 Master Plan, urging that the committee make status quo recommendations in every area except financing, where increases in state support were requested. One of the public hearings which best exemplifies the extent to which the segments had welded themselves to the status quo was the hearing on planning.

For many years the segments had been privately critical of the state higher education planning agency, the CCHE. Several studies including the Challenge of Achievement and the Palola, Lehmann and Blischke analyses had concluded that state planning in California was essentially ineffective. In addition, the very existence of a legislative master planning committee reflected a disenchantment and lack of confidence in existing planning mechanisms.

Yet the segmental testimony seemed oblivious to these concerns. In his testimony on governance, Charles Hitch, president of the University of California, asserted that the state's role in public higher education should be limited to assignment of missions to institutions or systems, appointment of governing board members, allocation of financial support and review of effective utilization of resources (18). Overall state planning and coordination was not even mentioned. Later testimony by a University of California spokesman endorsed the lack of state-level planning by implying that improved state planning would eliminate department, campus and system planning.

> One of the most important features of the present scene in higher education in California is the diversity and multiplicity of planning centers operating within the general framework set forth in the 1960 Master Plan . . . . the multiplicity of planning units, in departments, colleges, campuses, segments, and in governmental agencies and coordinating councils has contributed greatly to the

> quality of education in California. . . . to have one planning unit increases the probability that plans that are wrong will have dire consequences of great magnitude (22, p. 2).

The University's testimony typified the segmental positions. The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges called for a continuation of the status quo and the California State University and Colleges took a similar stance, while supporting some strengthening of the CCHE's role in "manpower and employment predictions, enrollment allocations and broad fiscal matters" (5, p. 16).

Though the hearings, which were held almost weekly in Sacramento for several months, tended to become somewhat tedious, they did allow for full exploration of the issues. The somewhat defensive posture of the segments became more and more apparent to the committee members. The credibility of the segments declined over the course of the hearings because their spokesmen would appear each week armed with voluminous defenses of the status quo, regardless of the subject area under discussion. It was just not possible for the committee members, most of whom had served in the legislature since at least the mid-1960's, to accept the utopian portrait of California higher education which was presented.

Commissioned Papers

Phase III of the study plan also included a series of position papers designed to respond to the questions raised in the open hearing

phase of the study. Beyond the obvious role of intelligence which these papers filled, they also increased the legitimacy of some of the alternative solutions to higher education problems which were offered by their authors. Table 3 (Appendix) lists the papers and authors and briefly describes each.

In several cases, publicity given to the papers increased public pressure to deal explicitly with the problem which they discussed. A good example of this is the effect of the paper on "Financing Postsecondary Education in California" which was written by the Academy for Education Development. The paper fully discussed a number of contemporary issues in the financing of higher education and provided three alternatives for tuition policy. Though none of the three was recommended, the press played up the alternative of full cost pricing as a recommendation, causing an emotional outcry effectively precluding rational debate on this issue.

Though the committee eventually failed to take a stand on this issue, what the paper and subsequent committee debate may have accomplished was to introduce into legislative thinking about both tuition and student aid, notions of equity, private and public benefits, foregone income, and so forth.

Other papers had more conclusive impact on final JLC recommendations. The final report of the JLC recommended the creation of a fourth and nontraditional segment of public higher education in California. Two papers influenced this recommendation: Warrn Bryan Martin's discussion of "Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California" which

described several strategies for curricular reform and for delivery of nontraditional education, and Richard Peterson's "Goals for California Higher Education" which demonstrated the rather low priority given by existing campus constituencies to off-campus and other nontraditional approaches.[5]

Draft Report

In early January 1973, the Joint Committee met in executive session for two days at a retreat in the Santa Barbara mountains. The purpose of this meeting was to develop a draft report, a statement of the tentative conclusions and recommendations to put before the public for review and comment. After two days of deliberation, the committee had reached agreement on some fifty-six recommendations for the draft report.

The report was issued in late February and received much attention from the newspaper and television media. Its major thrusts were two-fold: (1) Higher education exists primarily to facilitate learning, including personal growth, (2) In our pluralistic society, different kinds of persons with diverse learning needs and styles require a variety of institutions and programs. A suitable place in higher education must be assured for every person with a desire and motivation to benefit.

The report set the following goals for California Postsecondary

---

[5]Two of the papers discussed were the basis for subsequent publications: those of Peterson (24) and the Academy for Educational Development (1).

Education in the next decade:

(1) Academic freedom and responsibility

(2) Equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages, and geographic areas

(3) Lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit

(4) Diversity of institutions, services, and methods

(5) Flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society

(6) Cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources and in meeting those needs

(7) Involvement with local communities and utilization of community resources in the educational process

(8) Increased understanding of the learning process to be sought and applied throughout higher education

(9) Discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning, research, and teaching

(10) Accountability throughout higher education: of institutions to the individual for instruction and related services, of institutions to the public and its representatives, of faculty student and staff to the institutions, and of the public and its leaders to the institutions for support and development

The specific recommendations included:

(1) Adopting a continuous planning process in place of a state master plan.

(2) Increasing the participation of ethnic minorities and women in higher education. The report stated that the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and the California Community Colleges shall strive to approximate the general ethnic, sexual, and economic composition of the state by 1980. "This goal shall be achieved by provision of additional student spaces and not by the rejection of any qualified student."

(3) Changing the governance of higher education to shorten terms of University of California Regents to eight years and providing that appointment to the governing boards of the public higher education institutions be made by the Governor from nominations submitted by a Blue Ribbon Nominating Commission. A peer-selected student and faculty member would be added as non-voting members of each board.

(4) Creating a new Coordinating and Planning Agency and Postsecondary Education Commission to replace the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The commission would be composed of a clear majority of public representatives and representatives of all types of postsecondary

educational institutions.

(5) Establishing a new university without walls to coordinate and supplement current efforts to provide off-campus extended learning and credits and degrees for experimental and other types of learning.

(6) Expanding and improving the administration of financial aid programs.

(7) Creating Regional Councils to foster cooperation among colleges and universities to serve community needs for educational services.

(8) Establishing counseling centers to provide independent and comprehensive information on postsecondary opportunities to potential students of all ages.

(9) Establishing a state innovation fund to be funded at a level of three percent of the annual higher education budget.

(10) More flexible admission standards for the University of California and California State University and Colleges. The committee encouraged institutions to admit up to one-eighth of their freshman class by different criteria than they currently utilize. This will enable the colleges and universities to experimentally identify those students most capable of benefiting from the institution.

Response to Draft Report

Once the draft report had been published and widely circulated, the committee undertook another series of public hearings. Five hearings were held in different parts of the state.

The initial hearing was held at the state capitol and the principal witnesses were the chief executives of California's public systems of higher education. The general tenor of the testimony offered by these officials was laudatory of the Committee's efforts and the draft report. However, in the subsequent hearings on specific sections of the report, the official spokesmen for public higher education attacked nearly every section of the report calling for change except the recommendations for increased student financial assistance. Many sections of the report were supported by the student lobbies, faculty organizations, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities and other individuals and organizations.

Final Report and Recommendations

Upon completion of the hearings, committee members reviewed the draft report and the critiques and suggestions received, and decided upon the contents of the final report. The basic themes of the draft report and most of the recommendations were reaffirmed, with some refinement and a few deletions (8).

To enable the legislature to begin acting on the recommendations

during the 1973 session, the results of the committee's deliberations were released immediately, although the final report was not published until November.

Both the draft and final reports called for the creation of a new state planning commission to implement a more process-oriented and comprehensive approach to postsecondary education planning. This legislation passed both houses of the legislature during the 1973 session overwhelmingly and was signed by the Governor. The new commission came into existence on April 1, 1974. It began meeting in January, 1974, to organize itself, hire a staff, and arrange for transition with the CCHE.

Throughout the remainder of the 1973 and 1974 legislative sessions the committee introduced or supported a series of resolutions, bills, and constitutional amendments implementing the recommendations of its final report. By the end of the 1974 session the legislature had acted on most of the recommendations. Though the recommendations were subjected to the usual amendments and modifications as they moved through the legislature process, most of the committee's proposals were accepted by the legislature. Four constitutional amendments received the necessary two-thirds votes to qualify them for the November, 1974, general election ballot, but three of the four measures were defeated.[6]

---

[6]There is no precise way of accounting for the defeat of these propositions at the polls. None had substantial organized oppositions. Some possible explanations for their failure are: (1) The propositions

EVALUATION, COMPARISON, ANALYSIS

Quite clearly, any satisfactory evaluation of the work of the JLC must await the passage of a period of time sufficient to observe: (1) which of the committee's recommendations are implemented at the level of legislative statute or state higher education policy in California; (2) of these, which are actually implemented in accord with the real intent of the committee; and (3) of these, which appear to effect real improvement in the structure, process, or programs of higher education within the state.

Some evidence is now available with respect to the first two of these criteria (Table 4 in Appendix). Another way of evaluating

---

were highly technical and received little attention in the press prior to the election; they may not have been understood by the voters, particularly since there were approximately twenty state propositions before them. The proposition which received the most press coverage was adopted; (2) The language and ballot argument for the proposition providing for civil service exemptions for the California Postsecondary Education Commission created a widespread impression that the effect would be the creation of additional political patronage in Sacramento; the transfer of authority to set tuition in the University of California system from the Regents to the legislature may have been interpreted as an attempt to inject politics into higher education, particularly by voters who did not realize that the legislature already had authority over student charges in the state and community colleges.

the work of the committee is to emphasize what issues were not successfully met. These should include questions of: the internal governance of institutions, the destructive erosion of credibility of institutions of higher education, the problem of tenure, the curriculum itself and the perhaps overriding question of anticipating enrollment declines in a steady-state fiscal situation by providing for a rational reallocation of resources and programs. The committee's wisdom in declining these challenges will be ratified only if the new Postsecondary Education Commission proves to be the agency to do so.

The process followed by the California restudy in some ways observes the canons set down by current expert recommendations on planning, and in other ways violates them. The Carnegie Commission recommended that "a state's initial development of a broad post-secondary educational plan be undertaken by a commission appointed for that purpose with a small staff augmented by special task forces as needed, selected so as to assure participation by both public representatives and leaders of educational constituencies" (10, p. 36). For the legislature itself to undertake the planning function through a committee of its membership is an unusual planning approach. The desirable goals achieved by this approach include: (1) maintaining the planning function as distinct from operational responsibilities of a coordinating-type agency, and (2) direct responsibility to the public via elected representatives. (See, for instance, 13.) Potential liabilities of this approach are: (1) a relatively nonparticipatory process, (2) a disabling distance from the institutions. These latter

aspects are also recurring themes in the literature of contemporary higher education planning. Attempts were made, as should be clear from the details of this paper, to satisfy both. As Table 5 (Appendix) shows, commitment to participation was an initial and ongoing concern. Institutional participation was also valued and encouraged throughout the study. Whether the sense of shared decision-making is strongly felt on the part of institutions when the process is embedded in the legislative branch of government will probably reveal itself over time. It seems probable that, in avoiding the kind of institutional control of the planning process which was the case in the initial California Master Plan, a certain felt disenfranchisement on the part of institutions becomes inevitable.

It is clear, then, that any adequate evaluation of California's master planning effort requires an unfolding of the consequences of its efforts and recommendations. Certainly the process followed here is an outgrowth of the particular environment of the state and time in which it took place. Two elements of that environment deserve note. First, California is a highly educated state. The soil in which the critique of higher education performed by the master plan restudy took place is, paradoxically, California's citizenry which has been well served by those institutions which were criticized, and which has, in turn, both valued and supported those institutions. The paradox is that an intelligent criticism of these institutions is perhaps not possible without the sophistication which the institutions help to develop.

Secondly, planning is a political process, and since it involves

the allocation, or proposed allocation, of energy, power, and money, American higher education is coming to willingly admit publicly what has always been true, and probably always has been admitted privately, that higher education is deeply embedded in the political process. One facet of this in the California study is the relative distribution of power among institutions now as compared with 1959, when the original Master Plan was developed. Then, the University of California was instrumental in protecting its hegemony over higher education in the state against the much less coordinated and concentrated power of the State Colleges and Community Colleges. In the 1970's, that power equation is changed. Insofar as the final report can be seen as affected by the lobbying efforts of the institutions themselves, it seems clear that the University's power to preserve that hegemony is not as secure; that the final result appears much more a result of a balancing of interests, desires, exigencies, and imperatives of institutions, legislature, executive, and general public. It seems plausible that this diffusion of power, compared with ten years earlier, contributed to the effectiveness of a participatory model of planning.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1 (9)

PHASE	DURATION	OBJECTIVES	PROCESS
I	June, 1971 - October, 1971	(1) Identification of important questions (2) Involvement of public and educators	Hearings on "the future" Appointment of ad hoc advisory committee on questions and issues Letters to citizens Meetings, interviews on campuses Hearings: What are the significant questions? How should the committee deal with these questions?
II	November, 1971 - January, 1972	(1) Development of plan for study of California Higher Education	Evaluation of input from Phase I Adoption of plan by Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education
III	February, 1972 - December, 1972	(1) Implementation of study	Public hearings on substantive subject areas identified in study plan Consultant studies
IV	January, 1973 - August, 1973	(1) Publication of preliminary report (2) Public response to draft report (3) Publication of Final Report	Draft Report Public hearings Evaluation of response to draft report Final Report

TABLE 2

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (PHASE II)

Structure of Public Higher Education	February 9, 1972
Governance and Coordination of California Higher Education	February 16 and February 23, 1972
Independent Higher Education	March 1, 1972
Alternative Forms of Higher Education	March 8 and March 22, 1972
Planning for Postsecondary Education	April 5, 1972
Financing Postsecondary Education	April 12 and April 19, 1972
Access to Higher Education	April 26 and May 3, 1972
Regional Articulation and Cooperation among Institutions of Higher Education	May 22, 1972
Regional Articulation and Cooperation among Institutions of Higher Education	September 11, 1972

TABLE 3

	TITLE	AUTHOR	DESCRIPTION
1.	"Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California"	Warren Bryan Martin	Alternative models for delivering nontraditional study; curriculum reform in existing institution; new models of learning based on both affective and cognitive development.
2.	"Asian Americans in Public Higher Education in California"	Robert Yoshioka	The pre-college experiences of California's Asian-Americans, their access to and participation in higher education, the status of Asian-American studies.
3.	"Black and Public Higher Education in California"	Nairobi Research Institute	Essays on access to higher education for Black students; problems of retention and Black participation in graduate education.
4.	"Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California"	Ronald Lopez and Darryl D. Enos	Pre-college experiences of Chicanos' access to higher education, student financial assistance, ethnic studies and affirmative action.
5.	"Evaluating Higher Education in California"	Michael Scriven	Recommends systematic evaluation of teaching, institutional content, personnel and curriculum under the sponsorship of an independent agency which would have as its primary responsibility pre- and post-testing.
6.	"Financing Postsecondary Education in California"	Academy for Educational Development	Examines three models of state financing--low tuition, full cost pricing, and mixed--and assesses the impact of each model on access, student financial assistance and cost to the state.

	TITLE	AUTHOR	DESCRIPTION
7.	"Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities"	Richard E. Peterson	Based upon results of administration of the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) to students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and local community people throughout California. Report shows the perceptions of those constituent groups of institutional goals as they <u>are</u> and as they <u>should be</u>.
8.	"The Role of Research in California Higher Education"	Lewis Mayhew	Probable overemphasis of research at the University of California; need for shift in emphasis from basic to applied research; questions assumption that UC should have monopoly on research in public higher education and that all faculty members at UC should be engaged in research all the time; effects of research on teaching.
9.	"Independent Higher Education in California"	Fred Nelson	History and contributions of independent higher education to California and discussion of alternative forms of state assistance to independent institutions.
10.	"Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education"	Academy for Educational Development	Survey of current arrangements and programs involving interinstitutional cooperation. Discussion of policy alternatives available to the state if encouragement of such cooperation is deemed desirable.
11.	"Graduate Education in California"	Lewis Mayhew	Possible overexpansion of graduate education and policy alternatives for the state.

TABLE 4

LEGISLATIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JLC

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT (7)	PURPOSE	STATUS
1	Statement of goals for California Post-secondary Education	Adopted with the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 149
2, 3, 4, 5, 14, and 22	Revises Donahoe Higher Education Act and adds language implementing a continuous planning process and stating desirability of intersegmental cooperation	Adopted with the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 3011
6	Requests UC and CSUC to extend idea of differentiation of function within respective segments for individual campuses	Adopted with passage of ACR 156
7, 9, 10, and 11	Substantial changes in the Board of Regents and creation of Higher Education Nominating Committee for all three segmental governing boards	Reforms adopted by Legislature in significantly amended form with passage of Senate Constitutional Amendment (SCA) 45 and AB 2586. SCA 45 on November, 1974, ballot as Proposition 4 and was adopted; AB 2586 vetoed by the Governor. A relative proposition which would have replaced the Lieutenant Governor by the President pro tempore of the Senate was defeated by the voters.

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT	PURPOSE	STATUS
12	Provision of conflict of interest regulations for governing board members	AB 2759 dropped due to the passage of Proposition 9 on June, 1974, ballot. Legal determination pending concerning applicability of Proposition 9
13	Urges maintenance of constitutional status for the University of California	No change required
15, 17, 18, 20, and 26	Creation of Postsecondary Education Commission and delineation of functions and membership	Implemented with the passage of AB 770 (1973)
16	Urges constitutional status for Commission and civil service exemption for staff	Proposed amendment providing Commission constitutional status; proposed exemption of three Commission staff members approved by Legislature in Assembly Constitutional Amendment (ACA) 86 placing Proposition 3 on the November, 1974, ballot. Failed to win approval of electorate.
19	Improvement of legislative staff working in higher education	Implemented with continuance of the Joint Committee
21	Requiring central offices of CSUC and UC to be in Sacramento	Legislation killed in the Assembly

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT	PURPOSE	STATUS
23, 25, and 28	Determines admission criteria for three segments; provides greater flexibility in special admissions; urges experimentation with eligibility criteria; requires annual reports by four-year segments concerning the use of nontraditional criteria; recommends 40% ceiling for lower division student population for four-year campuses; assigns responsibility for articulation procedures to the Postsecondary Education Commission	All provisions fully implemented with the passage of ACR 150
24	Urges that ethnic, sexual, and economic underrepresentation in student bodies be overcome by 1980; requires submission to the Commission of plans for doing so	Adopted by passage of ACR 151; plans to be submitted by July 1, 1975
26	Urges elimination of fee structures which discriminate against part-time students	Adopted with passage of ACR 161 requiring reports by segments and Commission on existing policies and justification for any discriminatory fees
27, 30, and 35	Requires submission of plans by the Commission for (1) independent counseling centers, (2) regional, interinstitutional councils, (3) statewide fund for innovation	Adopted with passage of ACR 159 and supplemented appropriation to Commission for the studies within the 1974-75 Budget Act
29	Relating to criteria utilized for admissions	No legislative action taken

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT	PURPOSE	STATUS
31	Requests that regional planning be given high priority in utilizing federal funds for postsecondary planning	Adopted with passage of ACR 153
32	Calls for establishment of a fourth, nontraditional public segment of higher education; recommends development of an action-oriented plan	Adopted through passage of SCR 81 (1973) and $150,000 appropriation in 1974-75 Budget Act; feasibility study underway
33	Urges Commission to study the idea of a "College of California" operated by nonacademic professionals	No legislative action taken
34 and 35	Requests segments to reallocate a significant percentage of their respective budgets to support innovative programs and improvements in cost-effectiveness	Adopted with passage of ACR 157 which requires annual reporting by segments of reallocations made to support innovative programs
37	Requests independent colleges and universities to participate in interinstitutional programs	No legislative action taken
38 and 39	Recommends expansion of student aid programs	In part, adopted through expansion of State Scholarship program; more specific Joint Committee study has been undertaken

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT	PURPOSE	STATUS
40	Requests Commission to report annually to the Legislature and Governor concerning the financial condition of independent colleges and universities	Incorporated in AB 770.
41	Legislative determination of fee levels for instructional programs and facilities	Adopted by Legislature with passage of ACA 85; on November ballot as Proposition 16. Failed to win approval of electorate
42	Urges that tuition-generated revenues be utilized for student financial aid programs and not capital outlay	Adopted with passage of ACR 152
43 and 44	Expansion of and changes in student aid programs	Action delayed pending further legislative study of financial assistance currently underway
46	Requests Commission to report on compensation discrepancies for teaching and research	Adopted with passage of ACR 160
47	Urges the development of methods by which 45% of operating funds for community colleges be derived from state sources	Progress made through passage of Alquist Bill; no further legislative action

RECOMMENDATION NUMBER IN REPORT	PURPOSE	STATUS
48	Urges state budgeting and auditing emphasize programmatic rather than line item accountability	ACR 154 dropped due to objections of UC
49	Requests fiscal flexibility for individual campus by central segmental offices	Adopted with passage of ACR 155

TABLE 5

PARTICIPATORY ASPECTS OF JLC STUDY

1. Letters sent to 1500 Californians requesting views on important issues and questions (July, August, 1971)

2. Ad Hoc Advisory Committee - 90 persons of diverse backgrounds, occupations, etc., spent two days developing issues and questions (September, 1971)

3. Public hearing on proposed study plan (January, 1971)

4. Public hearings on major issues of the study (February-September, 1972)

5. Institutional Goals Inventory - survey instrument administered to students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and community people at 116 colleges (April-June, 1972)

6. Issuance of report in draft form followed by public hearings on recommendations (February, March, 1973)

LITERATURE CITED

1. Academy for Educational Development. Alternatives in State Government Financing of Higher Education. Washington, D.C., 1973.

2. Assembly Concurrent Resolution Number 198, Resolution Chapter 285, September 25, 1970.

3. Benveniste, Guy. The Politics of Expertise. Berkeley: The Glendessary Press, 1972.

4. Berdahl, Robert O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

5. Brossman, Sidney W. "Statement to the California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education." April 5, 1972.

6. California Legislature. The Challenge of Achievement. Sacramento, 1968.

7. California Legislature. Draft Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Sacramento, 1973.

8. California Legislature. Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Sacramento, 1973.

9. California Legislature. Study Plan of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. Sacramento, 1972.

10. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibilities for Postsecondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

11. Chronicle of Higher Education. Vol. VII, No. 36, June 18, 1973; Vol. IX, No. 17, January 27, 1975, p. 7.

12. Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The Master Plan Five Years Later. Sacramento, 1966.

13. Education Commission of the States. Coordination or Chaos: Report of the Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Postsecondary Education. Denver, 1973.

14. _____. Report of the Task Force on Statewide Comprehensive Planning for Postsecondary Education. Denver, 1971.

15. Glenny, Lyman A. "Nine Myths, Nine Realities: The Illusions of Steady State." Change. Vol. 6, No. 10, December-January, 1974-75.

16. _____, Robert O. Berdahl, Ernest G. Palola, and James G. Paltridge. Coordinating Higher Education for the 70's. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

17. Halstead, D. Kent. Statewide Planning in Higher Education. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1974.

18. Hitch, Charles J. "Governance and Coordination of California Higher Education." Statement to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, February 16, 1972.

19. Illinois Board of Higher Education. A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois (Phase I, Phase II, Phase III). Springfield, 1964, 1966, 1971.

20. Kerschner, Lee R. "Statement on Planning for Postsecondary Education to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education." April 7, 1972.

21. Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Board of Education, 1960.

22. McGuire, Joseph W. "Planning for Postsecondary Education." Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, April 5, 1972.

23. Palola, Ernest G., Timothy Lehmann, and William R. Blischke. Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970.

24. Peterson, Richard. Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1973.